

Letter C1b

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

RDEIR Public Comment to the Proposed Accretive Lilac Hills Ranch General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan PDS2012-3800-12-001 (GPA), PDS2012-3810-12-001 (SP)

Valley Center Community Planning Group Comments:**Executive Summary: Lilac Hills Ranch RDEIR Responses****Introduction**

This Executive Summary is intended to aid reviewers of the comments on the Lilac Hills Ranch Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report [RDEIR] submitted by the Valley Center Community Planning Group. The review of the DEIR prepared by the County Department of Planning and Development Services, the Lilac Hills Ranch Specific Plan prepared by the applicant, and many technical reports that are the basis of the RDEIR prepared by various consultants, has generated a significant volume of comments. The thousands of pages that make up the RDEIR documents and their sometimes very technical nature made it difficult for volunteers to review and respond to every item in the relatively short time allowed. However, the principle issues are addressed in some detail in the responses that accompany this summary.

This summary does not substitute for the detailed comments and analyses presented in the attached comment documents.

C1b-1

C1b-1

This comment is an introduction to comments that follow. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

A. AREAS OF CONTROVERSY – Project's Ability to Acquire Legal Right of Way

1. THIS SECTION NEEDS THE ADDITION OF A FRANK AND SUCCINCT DISCUSSION OF THE PROJECT'S FACTUAL LACK OF LEGAL RIGHT OF WAY FOR ROADS, SEWER, AND RECYCLED WATER. FACTUAL AND QUANTITATIVE DISCUSSION NEEDS TO BE MADE PROMINENTLY APPARENT TO DECISION MAKERS ON HOW OFFSITE IMPROVEMENTS REQUIRED FOR THIS PROJECT WILL BE ACQUIRED. THERE ARE FACTUALLY 30 OR MORE RIGHT OF WAY ACQUISITIONS THAT PROJECT REQUIRES. THE PROJECT HAS MADE LITTLE PROGRESS IN FOUR YEARS ON ACQUIRING REQUIRED RIGHT OF WAY. IT IS HIGHLY LIKELY THAT THE USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN FOR A MINIMUM OF THIRTY AND LIKELY GREATER NUMBER OF SEPARATE TAKINGS OF UNWILLING PROPERTY OWNERS' LAND OR INTEREST IN ROAD AND UTILITY EASEMENTS WILL BE REQUIRED TO MAKE THIS PROJECT FEASIBLE.

The County of San Diego has received hundreds of pages of factual information from multiple Attorneys that demonstrate the absence of many legal rights for

C1b-2

C1b-2

The FEIR adequately analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with construction of the off-site improvements as required under CEQA. With respect to related property rights, please see the Global Response: Off-Site Improvements – Environmental and Easement Analysis Summary Table, which describes the respective off-site improvements, corresponding environmental analysis, status of easement rights, and affected properties. Please also see Global Response: Easements (Covey Lane and Mountain Ridge Roads) included in the introduction to these responses to comments, for additional information responsive to this comment.

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>the Project's intended use of private roads and right of way for Sewer and Recycled water utility pipelines.</p>	C1b-2 cont.	C1b-3	The alternatives for off-site routes for sewer and water pipelines are identified in the Wastewater Management Report (Appendix S of the FEIR). As shown in FEIR Figures 3.1-7a, 3.1-7b, and 3.1-7c-1 and 3.1-7c-2 all piping (potable water, recycled water, and sewer lines) proposed within any potential routes, including Covey Lane, Mountain Ridge, and Circle R Drive, would have adequate spacing and would be able to fit within the existing Right of Way.												
<p>The Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD) has verified that the Project has proposed pipeline routes for which no legal right of way currently exists for Sewer and Recycled Water. To use the Project's preferred Sewer and Recycled Water pipelines for this project, Eminent Domain taking of right of way is required. The Project's Alternate 4 pipeline route is claimed by the Applicant to have full legal right of way. However, as pointed out in Chapter 3 Public Comments, this claim requires substantiation in the three areas questioned.</p>				C1b-3											
<p>The County has taken the position that Private Road right of way disputes are between individual private parties. That said, the County of San Diego has certain knowledge that offsite road improvements for the Project will require right of way for at least thirty separate takings of unwilling property owners' land or interest in road easements.</p>				C1b-4											
<p>The County has not been clear about Public information on required right of way for Offsite Improvements for assessment of Environmental Impact. We ask that the County provide the following information:</p>	C1b-4	C1b-4	See Global Response: Easements (Covey Lane and Mountain Ridge Roads) included in the introduction to these responses to comments for a discussion of the project's easement rights.												
<p>The County needs to disclose the following information so that impacts are identified and required Mitigation can be implemented.</p>				C1b-5											
<p><u>A). Required Disclosure of Relevant Information regarding legal rights for construction of Off Site Improvements as well as how the Applicant intends to gain legal rights</u></p>				C1b-5											
<p>In the DEIR, the County has not provided adequate disclosure regarding off-site impacts of the Project and its Alternatives to surrounding property owners.</p>	C1b-5	C1b-5	All of the impacts related to off-site improvements have been quantified, described, and included in the FEIR throughout Chapters 2.0 and 3.0. All off-site improvements associated with each alternative is analyzed and discussed throughout Chapter 4.0 of the FEIR. See response to comment I51b-1, above. See Global Response: Off-site Improvements - Environmental Analysis and Easement Summary Table which describes the respective off-site improvements, corresponding environmental analysis, status of easement rights, and affected properties												
<p>This information is necessary to demonstrate Project Feasibility that the Project can ever be legally built.</p>				C1b-6											
<p>For the Project and each of its Alternatives, provide the following information regarding off-site improvements for which Accretive Investments currently holds less than full legal right of way. For each impacted parcel, indicate what the Applicant has done to attempt to secure legal rights. Disclose how the Applicant or the County intends to secure the necessary legal rights for these parcels:</p>				C1b-6											
<table><tr><td>sq. ft.</td><td>sq. ft. Right</td><td>sq.ft.Slope</td><td>Total</td></tr><tr><td><u>Parcel Number</u></td><td><u>Property Owner</u></td><td><u>of Way required</u></td><td><u>Easement</u></td></tr><tr><td><u>Encroachment</u></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	sq. ft.	sq. ft. Right	sq.ft.Slope	Total	<u>Parcel Number</u>	<u>Property Owner</u>	<u>of Way required</u>	<u>Easement</u>	<u>Encroachment</u>						
sq. ft.	sq. ft. Right	sq.ft.Slope	Total												
<u>Parcel Number</u>	<u>Property Owner</u>	<u>of Way required</u>	<u>Easement</u>												
<u>Encroachment</u>															

LETTER

RESPONSE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3	
<p>i) West Lilac Road Scenario 1 – Construction of West Lilac Road from Old Hwy 395 to proposed new Road 3b to 2.2 C Road Standards as is the General Plan Baseline. No information on offsite improvements has been provided by the County for the full route of this Alternative, which is the present General Plan Mobility Element baseline.</p> <p>Scenario 2 a – As per "Right of Way Analysis W. Lilac Rd Alt 1 2.2C/2.2F dated Oct 31, 2013 with additional land necessary to incorporate Reid Middleton Roundabout design modification recommendations identified.</p> <p>The Oct 31, 2013 study found that 22 parcels were impacted for a total of 4.3 acres. The Study did not quantify the additional parcels impacted by Roundabout redesigns recommended by Reid Middleton. Please include a current and accurate disclosure of the parcels as impacted by Roundabout redesign.</p> <p>Scenario 2 b – As per "Right of Way Analysis W. Lilac Rd Alt 1 2.2 C dated Oct 31, 2013 with additional land necessary to incorporate Reid Middleton Roundabout design modification recommendations identified. The Oct 31, 2013 study found that 22 parcels were impacted for a total of 5.6 acres. The Study did not quantify the additional parcels impacted by Roundabout redesigns recommended by Reid Middleton. Please include a current and accurate disclosure of the parcels as impacted by Roundabout redesign.</p> <p>Scenario 3 – Impact of improvement from non-compliant 2.2F to 2.2E configuration to improve horizontal curves and provide bicycle lanes in each direction and 8 foot shoulders for West Lilac Road from Easterly boundary of Subdivision (currently near existing Lilac Walk private road intersection) to Covey Lane. This scenario is discussed further in section 2). Direct Impacts to West Lilac Road section of this letter.</p> <p>ii). Covey Lane/West Lilac Intersection</p> <p>Scenario 1 – Impact of construction to Applicant's proposed design including Sight Distance Clearance and turn tapers. Please carefully analyze the need for Additional Slope Easements beyond those granted in IOD's.</p> <p>iii). Mountain Ridge Private Road including Mountain Ridge/Circle R Intersection</p> <p>Scenario 1 – Impact of improvement to Applicant's proposed design including Sight Distance Clearance and turn tapers.</p>	<p>C1b-7 Scenario 1 - Proposed improvements to West Lilac Road are discussed in their entirety in Chapter 1.0 of the FEIR. Specifically, the project proposes improvements to West Lilac Road from Old Highway 395 to Road 3. Impacts associated with these improvements have been considered throughout the appropriate subchapters of the FEIR, and are included in the cumulative impacts section of each subject as well. Please also see response to comment I51b-5.</p> <p>Scenario 2a - The commenter accurately represents that a redesign of the roundabouts resulted from the Reid Middleton Roundabout Study. The revised design is reflected in the current project description. All impacts are located within the original footprint of the roundabout. The roundabout redesign would impact off-site areas; however, those areas are within existing Irrevocable Offers of Dedication (IODs) with both slope and drainage rights. No new impacts would occur based on the roundabout redesign. The FEIR adequately analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with construction of the off-site physical improvements as required under CEQA. With respect to related property rights, please see Global Responses: Easements (Mountain Ridge Road and Covey Lane) and Environmental Analysis and Easement Summary Table which describes the respective off-site improvements, corresponding environmental analysis, status of easement rights, and affected properties.</p> <p>Scenario 2b and 3 - The commenter is referencing a second alignment study associated with the Reid Middleton Roundabout Study. This design was not selected to be included in the project and is not relevant for inclusion in the project's CEQA analysis.</p> <p>C1b-8 As discussed below, the scope of the slope rights included in the referenced IODs is sufficient to encompass all necessary grading and earthwork and, therefore, no additional slope rights beyond those granted are necessary for road construction. As to sight distance clearance, as shown in the Global Response, Off-Site Improvements – Environmental Analysis and Easement Summary, a clear space easement on APN: 129-190-44 is necessary in order to remedy the existing deficient condition at the intersection.</p>

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1b-8 (cont.)</p> <p>Attachment 1 to the Global Response: Off-Site Improvements – Environmental Analysis and Easement Summary, is a memorandum prepared by engineers Landmark Consulting that addresses access rights on both Mountain Ridge Road and Covey Lane (Landmark Memorandum). The Landmark Memorandum determined that for both roads, there are existing road easements or Irrevocable Offers to Dedicate Real Property (IODs) that provide the necessary rights to improve these roads to accommodate the proposed Project and no additional easements are required for road construction.</p> <p>Landmark Memorandum Exhibit I, IOD for parcel no. 80-0494-A1, states that the rights offered include “the privilege and right to extend drainage structures and excavation and embankment slopes beyond the limits of the herein described right-of-way where required for the construction and maintenance of said County highway.” (Ex. I, p. 839.) Landmark Memorandum Exhibit J, parcel map no. 18536, further states “we hereby dedicate to the public that portion of Covey Lane for use as a street as shown on said map together with the right to extend and maintain drainage facilities, excavation and embankment slopes beyond the limits of said right-of-way.” (Ex. J, Sheet 1 of 4.). Thus, the IODs convey grading and drainage rights beyond the limits of the right-of-way.</p> <p>Landmark Memorandum Exhibit H, Covey Lane Off-Site Access, illustrates the grading limits necessary to construct the public road; the grading limits are the furthest the slopes would extend on each side of the future public road. As shown, the grading limits do not extend beyond the available right-of-way, except adjacent to the right-of-way described in the IOD dedicated with Parcel Map No. 18536 and, as described above, this IOD includes slope rights that permit slopes beyond the limits of the right-of-way.</p> <p>Thus, the slope rights associated with the IODs, as described above, along with the future dedication of right-of-way, as permitted with the private road easement that benefits Lilac Hills Ranch (see Landmark Memorandum Exhibit K), provide all of the rights necessary to construct the public road portion of Covey Lane to the Project boundary, including the slopes necessary to support said public road. As to sight distance clearance, as noted above and as shown in the Global Response, Off-Site Improvements – Environmental</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1b-8 (cont.)</p> <p>Analysis and Easement Summary, a clear space easement on APN: 129-190-44 is necessary in order to remedy the existing deficient condition at the intersection. Please also see Global Responses: Easements (Mountain Ridge Road and Covey Lane) and Environmental Analysis and Easement Summary Table, for additional information responsive to this comment.</p> <p>C1b-9</p> <p>Mountain Ridge Road is currently a two-lane private road that provides limited access from the project site to the County's public road system via Circle R Drive. Mountain Ridge Road does not currently meet the County's Private Road Standards and improvements to this roadway are proposed by the Project. As described in Chapter 1.0 of the FEIR and shown in Table 1-2, the project proposes to design Mountain Ridge Road as a wider, slower roadway. As proposed, the project would reduce dangerous vertical curves along the roadway. Additionally, the project proposes to remove the taper requirement at the intersection of Circle R Drive in order to provide a smoother and less impactful transition onto this road. As shown on FEIR Table 2.5-2 and illustrated in Figure 2.5-2b, no off-site impacts would occur to existing biology as a result of the road design. Additionally, as discussed in Appendix C-1 to the FEIR, while sight distance issues do not currently exist due to recent vegetation clearing, the project will be required to obtain an off-site clear space easement in order to ensure sight distance in perpetuity.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>Scenario 2 – Impact of improvement of Mountain Ridge Private Road to 30 Mph Private Road Design Speed Standards including Sight Distance Clearance and turn tapers.</p> <p>Scenario 3 – Impact of construction of Mountain Ridge Private Road to Public Road Design Standards including Sight Distance Clearance and turn tapers.</p> <p>iv). Rodriguez private road. Please further enumerate the all improvements proposed for Rodriguez Road as represented in Master Preliminary Grading Plan TM 5571 RPL 4 Sheet 7 of 12. Provide the legal basis of rights to construct the improvements to Rodriguez Road. Provide a copy for Public Review of document 2013-0021800 Rec. 1-11-2013.</p> <p>Property Rights ARE a DEIR Issue. Without the acquisition of land for offsite improvements, this Project IS INFEASIBLE.</p> <p>2. PHASING</p> <p>Phasing – The Applicant seeks the utmost in flexibility in developing the Project in Phases of which there are many possible permutations, and no assurance whatsoever of Project performance of Conditions of Development.</p> <p>The County has endorsed this approach without any assurance of performance by the Applicant, such as bonded indemnification to ensure specific performance.</p> <p>The Applicant states in the Specific Plan and the County states in the RDEIR that some Phases may never be built. Mitigations for Traffic Impacts are tied to events that may never happen. This is a serious defect with the RDEIR. There is no assurance that promised Mitigation will ever occur.</p> <p>Refer to the following Table 1 – 4 from Chapter 1 EIR Objectives page 1- 34.</p>	<p>C1b-10 Rodriguez Road is an existing 40-foot-wide private easement road that would require surface improvements necessary to accommodate the secondary emergency access requirement for the Phases 4 and 5. Specifically, Rodriguez Road would be improved from its current state to a 28-foot graded/ 24-foot paved roadway within the existing 40-foot easement. However, the County previously approved Sukup TM 5184-1 Improvement Plans and TPM 20457, which also includes construction of Rodriguez Road to County Private Road Standards. The approved Sukup plans include realignment of the middle portion of Rodriguez Road, which requires additional access and slope easements. The Sukup project obtained the necessary easements to construct these improvements. Refer to the Global Response: Off-site Improvements - Environmental Analysis and Easement Summary Table for additional details about the project's easement rights related to Rodriguez Road.</p> <p>C1b-11 The project is designed so that each phase of construction would trigger specific mitigation measures. It is correct that if those phases are never built, the mitigation would not be required. The project's Conditions of Approval would further assure that specific mitigation measures would occur prior to the construction of each construction phase. As stated at FEIR subchapter 2.3.5, traffic impact mitigation is tied to recordation of Final Maps involving a specific Equivalent Dwelling Unit count for the project. This phase's mitigation to correspond to the phased introduction of increased impacts. A subject Final Map can't be recorded unless the mitigation is assured through the installation of improvements or the execution of a secured agreement to install them in the future.</p> <p>Further, consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(1), implementation of mitigation measures will be ensured through adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project as part of the CEQA Findings, as well as by project Conditions of Approval.</p>
---	---

TABLE 1-24
GRADING QUANTITIES BY PHASE (cy)

Phase	Cut	Fill	Net
1	715,000	860,000	(145,000)
2	635,000	830,000	(195,000)
3	1,815,000	1,260,000	555,000
4	295,000	420,000	(125,000)
5	610,000	700,000	(90,000)
TOTAL	4,070,000	4,070,000	-

The Project represents that it requires no import or export of soil for all Phases in total. The Project requests any possible Phase implementation sequence. It is **clear** that Phase 3 is the source of fill dirt **for all of the other four Phases** and is required to be at least partially graded concurrently with the first and any other Phase. Please identify how the Project intends to implement Phase 1 without grading on Phase 3. Also, will Phase 3 be used as a quarry for fill dirt for an extended period?

The County of San Diego is deficient for not recognizing this most basic disconnect. The net result of this is a Significant Impact of Project Feasibility.

This example of infeasibility or vastly different Environmental Impacts is repeated over and over again with every Infrastructure aspect: Roads, Sewers, Waste Water, etc.

The timing of implementation of Mitigation is also required to be defined with much more rigor than the County has employed. Road Improvement from Significant Impacts are 'triggered' by attainment of a threshold number of Residential Units. The County of San Diego should recognize that certain Commercial Land Uses are far greater drivers of Traffic Impacts than Residential.

Another related defect of this "Phase Game" is that the sum of the Traffic related analyses, for example, have analyzed fewer than 50% of the possible permutations of Phase execution that the County has endorsed in this EIR.

Left with the unbounded Phasing strategy the Applicant proposes, the Project as implemented will have vastly different Environmental Impacts than those analyzed in this EIR.

The Project needs to be required to adopt a defined Phasing Plan sequence with only a few allowable Phase Alternates in order that the proper Environmental Impacts can be assessed.

C1b-12
cont.

C1b-13

C1b-14

C1b-12 Project grading is discussed in Chapter 1.0 of the FEIR. With respect to the net import or export of fill, project construction would be a balanced cut/fill operation as shown on FEIR Table 1-4; Throughout the phasing of the construction, however, there are some areas with a net cut and other areas with a net import. The project will be using those sites with net cut for borrow sites. Phase 3 land will be used as a borrow pit, which use will be required to comply with all applicable government regulations and requirements, including provisions of the County Grading Ordinance found at Section 87.101 et seq. of the San Diego County Code.

With respect to the last paragraph of this bracketed comment, the comment does not raise a specific environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue with respect to the FEIR, no further response is required.

C1b-13 The phasing plan discussed at FEIR subchapter 1.2.1.10, as well as Section 5 of the Traffic Impact Study (Appendix E), describe the traffic trips for both the equivalent residential dwelling units and the commercial uses, if any, in each phase of the project. Pursuant to Section 5 of the Traffic Impact Study (Appendix E) and subchapter 2.3.5 of the FEIR, the phased traffic mitigation measures therefore relate both to residential and commercial traffic trips generated in each phase. Further, the commercial uses for the project generate only 33% of peak hour traffic trips at project build-out. As a result, the recommended mitigation measures are appropriately tied to the approval of a specified number of residential dwelling units associated with final maps because the commercial uses within each Final Map have been translated into equivalent residential dwelling units. Therefore, the timing appropriately considers both residential and commercial uses.

C1b-14 The Specific Plan, Section IV Implementation includes a Community Phasing Plan, starting on page IV-1. Construction of the project is anticipated to occur over an eight to twelve year period in response to market demands and to provide a logical and orderly expansion of roadways, public utilities, and infrastructure. The five phases of the project are shown in Figure 15a of the Specific Plan and phasing

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1b-14 (cont.)</p> <p>would be implemented through the recording of the Final Maps. Actual construction of dwelling units could occur in any order. For example, Phase 3 may be constructed after Phase 1, followed by Phase 2, etc. However, the applicant would be required to meet various commitments prior to approval of each Tentative Map or Tentative Parcel Map such as providing landscaping, street improvements, parks, open space dedications, and satisfying the mitigation measures included in the FEIR. As a result, regardless of the order of phasing, the environmental impacts would be fully mitigated prior to the impact occurring. The County has not identified any different environmental impacts that would occur due to the phasing order. See also response to comment I51b-18. The project's phasing plan is discussed at DEIR FEIR subchapter 1.2.1.10. The remainder of this comment expresses the opinions of the commentator only. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.</p>
--	--

B. Chapter 1

1. Project Objectives – The following excerpt from the RDEIR summarizes the Project Objectives:

1.1 Project Objectives

The proposed project is based on a wide range of reports that studied the different constraints and opportunities involving the project in concert with the County of San Diego and local community issues. The general components of the proposed project were determined using the project objectives described below.

1. *Develop a community within northern San Diego County in close proximity to a major transportation corridor consistent with the County's Community Development Model for a walkable pedestrian-oriented mixed-use community.*
2. *Provide a range of housing and lifestyle opportunities in a manner that encourages walking and riding bikes and that provides public services and facilities that are accessible to residents of both the community and the surrounding area.*
3. *Provide a variety of recreational opportunities including parks for active and passive activities, and trails available to the public that connect the residential neighborhoods to the town and neighborhood centers.*
4. *Integrate major physical features into the project design, including major drainages, and woodlands creating a hydrologically sensitive community in order to reduce urban runoff.*
5. *Preserve sensitive natural resources by setting aside land within a planned and integrated preserve area.*
6. *Accommodate future population growth in San Diego County by providing a range of diverse housing types, including mixed-use and senior housing.*
7. *Provide a broad range of educational, recreational, and social uses and economically viable commercial opportunities within a walkable distance from the residential uses.*

C1b-15

The County has structured the Objectives -of the EIR, in aggregate, so narrowly that only the Lilac Hills Ranch Project, as proposed by the applicant, can fulfill the Project Objectives, leading to a self-serving and biased environmental analysis. The VCCPG response takes exception to the implied claims that the Project meets all of its own objectives and suggests that other alternatives to the proposed Project may fit the objectives better.

C1b-16

Objective One

C1b-15

The commenter's statement of the project objectives is noted. The project objectives, developed by the County, are compliant with CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(b). The Guidelines require that a project description contain a statement of objectives sought by the proposed project and that the statement of objectives should include the underlying purpose of the project. In addition, the Project's Objectives do not limit the County from implementing reasonable alternatives to the Project. Alternatives need to satisfy "most of the basic objectives of the project." A reasonable range of alternatives are discussed in Chapter 4.0 of the FEIR.

C1b-16

The County disagrees that the objectives are biased. This comments makes various assertions but does not provide any basis for the assertions and does not identify a specific issue with the content of the FEIR, therefore a more detailed response cannot be provided. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. The County disagrees with the comment. Property located along I-15 or SR-76 could meet these objectives. FEIR subchapter 4.1.1.1 analyzed and rejected an off-site alternative.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 7

The County has structured Objective One of the EIR so narrowly that only the Lilac Hills Ranch Project can fulfill this Project Objective, leading to a self-serving and biased environmental analysis.

Objective Two

The Project does not meet its own objective for Objective Two.

Objective Three

We do not have any issues with this objective other than to state that any Project required to have a Discretionary Permit approved would have to comply with this objective.

Objective Four

The Project does not meet its own objective for Objective Four.

Objective Five

We do not have any issues with this Objective other than to state that any project required to have a Discretionary Permit approved would have to comply with this objective.

Objective Six

The County has structured the sixth Objective of the EIR so narrowly that only the Lilac Hills Ranch Project can fulfill this Project Objective, leading to a self-serving and biased environmental analysis.

Objective Seven

This objective is subjective and could be met by developing the Project at General Plan densities, which would preserve existing agricultural businesses and residential-based businesses.

C1b-16
cont.

1.2 Project Phasing

The Applicant seeks the utmost in flexibility in developing the Project in Phases of which there are many possible permutations, and no assurance whatsoever of Project performance of Conditions of Development. The County has endorsed this approach without any assurance of performance by the Applicant, such as bonded indemnification to ensure specific performance.

C1b-17

The Applicant states in the Specific Plan and the County states in the EIR that some Phases may never be built. Mitigations for Traffic Impacts are tied to events that may never happen. This is a serious defect with the EIR. There is no assurance that promised Mitigation will ever occur.

C1b-18

Refer to the following Table 1 – 4 from Chapter 1 RDEIR Objectives page 1- 34.

C1b-17 With respect to indemnification, a bonded indemnification to ensure construction is not required. A project cannot be required to be constructed. A Final Map cannot be recorded unless the mitigation is assured through the installation of improvements or the execution of a secured agreement to install them in the future. With respect to phasing and mitigation, please see response to comment C-1b-11.

C1b-18 See response to comment C1b-12.

LETTER

RESPONSE

TABLE 1-24
GRADING QUANTITIES BY PHASE (cy)

Phase	Cut	Fill	Net
1	715,000	860,000	(145,000)
2	635,000	830,000	(195,000)
3	1,815,000	1,260,000	555,000
4	295,000	420,000	(125,000)
5	610,000	700,000	(90,000)
TOTAL	4,070,000	4,070,000	-

The Project represents that it requires no import or export of soil for all Phases in total. The Project requests any possible Phase implementation sequence. It is **clear** that Phase 3 is the source of fill dirt **for all of the other four Phases** and is required to be at least partially graded concurrently with the first and any other Phase. Please identify how the Project intends to implement Phase 1 without grading on Phase 3. Also, will Phase 3 be used as a quarry for fill dirt for an extended period?

The County of San Diego is deficient for not recognizing this most basic disconnect. The net result of this is a Significant Impact of Project Feasibility. This example of infeasibility or vastly different Environmental Impacts is repeated over and over again with every Infrastructure aspect: Roads, Sewers, Waste Water, etc.

The timing of implementation of Mitigation must also be defined with much more rigor than the County has employed. Road Improvements from Significant Impacts are 'triggered' by attainment of a threshold number of Residential Units. The County of San Diego should recognize that certain Commercial Land Uses are far greater drivers of Traffic Impacts than Residential.

Another related defect of this "Phase Game" is that the sum of the Traffic related analyses, for example, have analyzed fewer than 50% of the possible permutations of Phase execution that the County has endorsed in this EIR.

Left with the unbounded Phasing strategy the Applicant proposes, the Project as implemented will have vastly different Environmental Impacts than those analyzed in this EIR.

The Project needs to be required to adopt a defined Phasing Plan sequence with only a few allowable Phase Alternates in order that the proper Environmental Impacts can be assessed.

C1b-18
cont.

C1b-19

C1b-20

C1b-19 See response to comment C1b-13.

C1b-20 See response to comment C1b-14.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 9

2. Project Inconsistencies with Regional and General Plans

In comments submitted over the last two years, the Valley Center Planning Group and the Valley Center Design Review Board have challenged the proponent's assertions that this SP/GPA is consistent with the adopted County General Plan [GP], or with Valley Center's Community Plan [CP], or with Valley Center Design Guidelines.

Our previous comments, which have been submitted separately, have also challenged the logic exhibited throughout Accretive Investment Group's Specific Plan and now in their Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR): that amending a particular GP Regional Category to suit the project somehow also reconciles the project's inconsistencies with a wide array of General and Community Plan Goals and Policies.

The proposed SP/GPA is inconsistent in broad and fundamental ways with the San Diego County General Plan and Community Plans of both Bonsall and Valley Center. Further, the RDEIR fails to disclose and analyze these broad and fundamental inconsistencies and their environmental consequences as CEQA requires. The RDEIR is derelict in concluding as it does that: "The proposed project includes a General Plan Amendment, which if approved, would result in the project being consistent with the General Plan" (Chapter 3 Environmental Effects Found Not To Be Significant, p. 3-87). An Amendment to the General Plan should not mitigate the serious environmental impacts of this Project.

This RDEIR fails to perform the analyses required for decision makers, first, to understand the parameters of this proposal, and, second, to appreciate the nature and reach of its impacts. The RDEIR has only a rudimentary matrix of so-called Consistency with the General Plan in appendix W. However, the serious and unbiased analysis of consistency with the General Plan and the Community Plans has not been produced.

Internal consistency is required of all County General Plans by California State Law. Therefore, in considering a Specific Plan, particularly one that requires amendments to an adopted General Plan, it is crucial to understand exactly where the Specific Plan is inconsistent with General Plan regional categories, land use designations and road classifications, principles, elements, goals and policies.

A Specific Plan is an implementation vehicle. Approval requires compliance with CEQA; consistency as well with the web of interconnected and mutually-supporting elements of the County General Plan, and consistency with the array of implementation actions, strategies and procedures that are in place to achieve the goals and policies that the General Plan sets forth. Inconsistency requires denial of the project OR

C1b-21

C1b-22

C1b-21 The County acknowledges your comment and opposition to the project. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. The Regional Categories Map and Land Use Maps are graphic representations of the Land Use Framework and the related goals and policies of the General Plan. (Chapter 3, page 18.)

The General Plan states that it is intended to be a dynamic document and must be periodically updated to respond to changing community needs. (General Plan, page 1-15) General Plan Policy LU-1.2 permits new villages that are consistent with the Community Development Model and meet the requirements set forth therein. Please refer to Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 and Appendix W for a thorough discussion on related topic. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

The commenter broadly questions the project consistency with the General Plan. The FEIR analyzes and concludes the project is wholly consistent with the General Plan. Please refer to Appendix W for a more thorough discussion of this topic. With regard to mention of consistency with the General Plan Guiding Principles, it should be noted that all of the goals and policies of the General Plan are based upon these principles which are set forth in Chapter 2 of the General Plan. (General Plan, p.2-6) The FEIR analyzes whether the project meets the ten Guiding Principles by its analysis of the appropriate policies that implement those principles throughout each of the subchapters of the FEIR and in Appendix W to the FEIR.

C1b-22 The commenter in general, questions project consistency with General Plan and in particular, consistency with county "smart growth policies." Please refer to Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 for a full discussion relevant to these issues.

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>adapting the General Plan to fit the Specific Plan – the tail wagging the dog. Changes of this magnitude (Land Use Policies, Mobility and Safety Elements) to the August 3, 2011 San Diego County General Plan would require revisiting the Environmental Impact of the San Diego County General Plan and likely invalidates the San Diego County General Plan EIR. Broad and fundamental amendments to adopted General and Community plans would require countywide environmental review.</p> <p>We all can understand why the applicants might want to avoid disclosing the array of GP and CP Goals and Policies that this project violates. But CEQA's purpose is not to gloss over or obscure inconsistencies in order to ease approval of this project. CEQA's purpose is disclosure. Therefore, the RDEIR for this SP/GPA must reckon specifically and individually with the General Plan Vision and Guiding Principles and the reflection of these in the Community Development Model, as well as with Goals and Policies across the GP's seven elements: Land Use, Mobility, Conservation and Open Space, Housing, Safety and Noise; as well as goals and policies of the Bonsall and Valley Center Community Plans.</p> <p>Once inconsistencies are disclosed there are only three ways to resolve them: reject the project, re-design the project, or re-build the County General Plan to suit these applicants. <u>Inconsistencies with General and Community Plans, Design Guidelines and other ordinances and policies are NOT subordinate to this project's Specific Plan, as the Specific Plan asserts.</u></p> <p>The full text of the General Plan and Community Plan Inconsistencies comments does an exhaustive analysis of several of the General Plan and Community Plan goals and policies to reveal the inadequacies of the proposed Project and the premise being advanced to allow its approval.</p> <p>C. Chapter 2: Significant Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project</p> <p>1. Biological Resources</p> <p>The RDEIR cites three sensitive plant species observed on the Project site as well as observations of 13 Group 1 animal species ranging from lizards, snakes and jackrabbits to raptors, passerine birds and mule deer. Beyond the cited plants and animals, the RDEIR notes the projected significant loss of several native plant habitats with special importance for the cited animal species and others such as mixed southern chaparral and coastal sage scrub.</p> <p>The RDEIR indicates that these significant losses can be mitigated off-site through the purchase of land within the draft PAMA based on a formula developed by the County. However, the RDEIR does not account for the loss of 608-acres of raptor foraging area, which includes both natural vegetation formations and agricultural lands. The proposal is to set aside 77-acres off-site</p>	<p>C1b-22 cont.</p> <p>C1b-23</p> <p>C1b-24</p> <p>C1b-23 The Regional Categories Map and Land Use Maps are graphic representations of the Land Use Framework and the related goals and policies of the General Plan. (Chapter 3, page 18.) The General Plan states that it is intended to be a dynamic document and must be periodically updated to respond to changing community needs. (General Plan, page 1-15) General Plan Policy LU-1.2 permits new villages that are consistent with the Community Development Model and meet the requirements set forth therein. Please refer to Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 and FEIR Appendix W for a thorough discussion on related topic. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.</p> <p>The commenter broadly questions the project consistency with the General Plan. The FEIR analyzes and concludes the project is wholly consistent with the General Plan. Please refer to Appendix W for a more thorough discussion of this topic. With regard to mention of consistency with the General Plan Guiding Principles, it should be noted that all of the goals and policies of the General Plan are based upon these principles which are set forth in Chapter 2 of the General Plan. (General Plan, p.2-6) The FEIR analyzes whether the project meets the ten Guiding Principles by its analysis of the appropriate policies that implement those principles throughout each of the subchapters of the FEIR and in Appendix W to the FEIR.</p> <p>C1b-24 The FEIR conclusions for impacts to sensitive species are based on site specific surveys for sensitive species as documented in Table 1 of Appendix G of the FEIR. Attachments 9 and 11 of Appendix G document the sensitive plant and wildlife species with the potential to occur on-site, their likelihood of occurrence and the factual basis for this determination. Significance conclusions consider their occurrence on-site, the suitability of the on-site habitat to support sensitive species, their relative abundance in the region, and the regional abundance of their preferred habitat. As most of the project site (approximately 76 percent) is marginal habitat (agricultural land, disturbed land, currently developed land) and the sensitive biological resource areas would be preserved on-site and off-site in conservation easements, the project would not result in a significant</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1b-24 (cont.)</p> <p>loss of habitat for the studied species. In addition, of the species with the potential to occur on-site, the FEIR demonstrates that a combination of the preservation of habitats suitable for these species, on-site or within draft PAMA lands, in combination with the abundance of species as documented in scientific literature, would result in less than significant sensitive species impacts.</p> <p>The determination was made using the best available information including the draft North County MSCP which focuses on the preservation of the larger, higher quality habitat blocks that are considered to contain the largest populations of sensitive species, allowing smaller less viable and fragmented habitat areas that support smaller populations of species outside of these core resource areas to be considered for development. The project site is outside of the draft North County MSCP PAMA areas, which are the most important locations for preservation of habitat and species</p> <p>The Biological Resources Report relies on the regional MSCP planning efforts within the county and southern California as the basis for the determination of where the highest quality habitats and regionally significant populations of sensitive species occur in relation to the project. For example, under subchapter 3.2.5 Preserve Components for the PAMA, the Draft North County Plan states, "This concept (PAMA) develops the preferred preserve configuration around large contiguous area of habitat, areas supporting important species populations or habitat areas, and important functional linkages and movement corridors between them." The project is not within a high priority area for habitat conservation.</p> <p>C1b-25 See response to comment C1b-24.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 11

for raptor foraging calculated using the losses of sensitive native vegetation. It does not include in that calculation the lost agricultural land foraging area.

The RDEIR suggests that the impacts to the three sensitive plants and 13 sensitive animals [and we assume the resident plants and animals not judged to be sensitive] are less than significant once mitigated, saying that none of the cited species represent significant populations or significant portions of regional populations. And yet, the RDEIR and Biological Resources Report offer no data to support those claims. Nor, do they offer data that show the local population densities of the cited species that can be compared to unanalyzed regional population densities.

The RDEIR notes that the riparian habitats on the Project site will be preserved in open space easements. Those portions of the riparian habitats destroyed by road crossings will be recreated on-site adjacent to the preserved existing habitats. However, the RDEIR gives short shrift to the edge effects it acknowledges [e.g. human intrusion, invasive plant species, domestic pets, noise, night light, etc.] pointing to fences and signage and weeding efforts to be managed by a county designated agency.

The RDEIR does not adequately account for the cumulative effects stemming from the impacts to the Project site. If we take San Diego County as the 'region' or even North San Diego County as the region, we should be looking at the historic extent of coastal sage scrub, southern mixed chaparral, southern coast live oak riparian woodland, coast live oak woodland, southern willow scrub, southern willow riparian woodland, and wetlands within that area compared to what exists today. We should then ask to what extent have these vegetation communities been extirpated and to what extent the remaining examples of those communities have significance. Comparing proposed destruction in one project with destruction that has or will result in a handful of other smaller projects isn't an effective measurement of cumulative effects.

2. Cultural Resources

The RDEIR and Cultural Resources Report address historic cultural sites on the Project site individually. They fail to regard the Project site overall in the context of nearby significant Native American village sites along the San Luis Rey River and its tributary, Moosa Creek. The Project site is rich with artifacts and occupation sites, but the proposed mitigation and preservation procedures appear to be piecemeal for a Project as large and transformative as this one.

The grading, by cut and fill techniques, of 4-million cubic yards of earth will jeopardize the opportunity for future study and appreciation of the basic integrity of the cultural significance of the larger area. There are suggestions in previous studies that an as yet undiscovered earlier human habitation of the Project site area, or a separate village from those already known may be present.

C1b-24
cont.

C1b-25

C1b-26

C1b-27

C1b-28

C1b-26 The FEIR, M-BIO-2, requires preparation of a Resource Management Plan (RMP). As detailed in M-BIO-2 (subchapter 2.5), the RMP shall address site preparation, irrigation system requirements, on-site culvert maintenance to allow for wildlife passage, plant palettes, installation procedure, and describe the maintenance and monitoring program for both the establishment of mitigation areas and the enhancement of mitigation areas per the project conceptual wetland revegetation plan (EIR Appendix G, Attachment 16) or requirements for habitat selection contained in the conceptual resource management plans (EIR Appendix G, Attachments 17 and 18).

The RMP will include success criteria for the creation, restoration, and/or enhancement of native habitats. In addition, the RMP would be required to achieve the following goals:

1. Preserve and manage the open space lands to the benefit of the flora, fauna, and native ecosystem functions reflected in the natural communities occurring within the RMP land.
2. Manage the land for the benefit of sensitive plant and wildlife species and existing natural communities, without substantive efforts to alter or restrict the natural course of habitat development and dynamics.
3. Reduce, control, and where feasible, eradicate non-native, invasive flora and/or fauna known to be detrimental to native species and/or the local ecosystem.
4. Maintain the character and function of certain agricultural areas within the wetland buffer and open space area. (Refer to MM-BIO-2).

Implementation of the RMP will ensure that edge effects would not compromise on-site mitigation

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1b-27 FEIR subchapters 2.5.2.2 and 2.5.4, both clearly state that impacts to coastal sage scrub habitat would be considered significant. Mitigation for coastal sage scrub impacts would still be required at the designated ratio whether or not the draft MSCP/PAMA is approved. The Draft Habitat Loss Permit contains the necessary findings in support of the habitat loss per the NCCP guidelines in the absence of an adopted MSCP document/plan. All impacts to coastal sage scrub are considered significant and require mitigation with or without the MSCP/PAMA per County and Wildlife Agency requirements. While the loss of small stands of CSS contribute to cumulative losses of this habitat type, the NCCP CSS programs focus on the more important task of preserving larger blocks of CSS habitat that have been shown to be more beneficial for the preservation of CSS and the diverse assemblage of organisms supported by this habitat type. In general, the larger the acreage the more significant the patch becomes, however, other factors such as presence of sensitive species may make smaller patches of habitat significant.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts to agricultural and biological resources are addressed in EIR subchapters 2.4.3 and 2.5.3, respectively. The selected cumulative project area represents those projects surrounding the project site with similar resources, habitats and within the same watershed as a means to analyze potential cumulative loss of these resources. The cumulative impacts analyses were completed in compliance with County Guidelines and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The FEIR also includes an analysis of consistency with General Plan policies. Refer to subchapter 3.1.4 and in Appendix W of the FEIR.</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1b-28 The FEIR appropriately analyzed all project impacts together and does not piecemeal the project as the comment suggests. Due to the variation between archaeological sites and the CEQA criteria for determining significance, each individual archaeological site must be evaluated for significance individually and, if necessary, mitigation must be developed specifically for each archaeology site. The analysis evaluates the entire site and off-site improvement areas as a whole and, as this comment points out, in the context of the cumulative study area.</p> <p>As indicated in the EIR, the project would preserve all known on-site resources that meet the CEQA significance criteria. The EIR identifies potentially significant impacts to unknown resources and an off-site site CA-SDI-5072 and identifies mitigation (M-CR-2 and M-CR-3) for those potential impacts. The importance of cultural resources under CEQA is tied to the archeological information the resources have. The proposed mitigation includes curating or, as appropriate, repatriating recovered materials. Also, documentation of the sites would be archived at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) that serves to make the information available to future researchers, so that associations with other sites and the overall area can be better addressed. As the proposed preservation and project mitigation preserves the archeological resource information for the future, the project's impacts are considered mitigated to below a level of significance.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>There are also concerns about the data recovery program and its methodology. Most of the previous studies of the area are 35 years old and more current studies may be needed to fully understand the significance of the site.</p> <p>3. Hazards, Hazardous Materials, Wildfires</p> <p>The development of the densely packed Project adjacent to agricultural areas presents the need to buffer those agricultural areas from the development and its sensitive receptors [schools, churches, senior centers, parks, homes]. However, there is no discussion in this subchapter of General Plan policy S-11.5, which requires development adjacent to agricultural operations in Semi-rural and Rural lands to adequately buffer agricultural areas and ensure compliance with relevant safety and codes where hazardous materials are used. The RDEIR instead chooses to address buffers against hazardous materials in the 2.4 Agricultural Resources subchapter. Perhaps it seems like more of an agricultural problem in that context than a problem caused by poorly placing an urban development in an agricultural context.</p> <p>The proposed wastewater recycling facility [WRF], if built will be using hazardous materials, such as chlorine, in its treatment process. The facility is only 686-feet from the proposed school site and only 250-feet from homes. Considering that there was a recent accidental spill of hazardous materials from a similar facility in Escondido, the conclusion that the risks from the use of toxic, hazardous materials are less than significant is overly optimistic, even under carefully controlled circumstances.</p> <p>The WRF will not be built to coincide with the earlier phases of the Project, requiring that sewage be trucked off-site for disposal. The same trucking issue will continue after construction is complete and the WRF is operational, in order to dispose of waste solids screened from the influent. What impact would the 2-3 times weekly truckloads of sewage and/or waste solids have on the safety of residents in the Project? Other potential issues are accidental sewage or sludge spills, not to mention the impact those frequent truck trips have on the traffic flow to and from the Project.</p> <p>The issues of emergency response and evacuation plans are troublesome for this Project. The Evacuation Plan does not address the most fundamental evacuation issue of the proposed Project – the limited number of roads for automobile evacuation of the 5185 residents of the proposed Project. The mobility element roads nearest the Project are West Lilac and Circle R Roads. Both roads were built as 2.2 E two-lane roads to serve a rural community with small, rural populations and the applicant plans no upgrades to these roads. The addition of 5000+ people at the Project site will severely impact both emergency response and evacuation during a crisis event, exacerbating already congested conditions in such circumstances and putting many people at risk.</p>	<p>C1b-29 The standard methodology of transect spacing was used in archaeological surveys. The archaeologists thoroughly checked bedrock outcrops, cut banks or other exposed soil profiles, and other high-potential areas during the evaluation. No comments have been expressed by the Tribes disagreeing with the methodology that was used.</p> <p>C1b-30 Significant impacts associated with agricultural adjacency issues are addressed in the FEIR subchapter 2.4. Mitigation measures are required to buffer on-site residential and other uses from off-site agricultural operations which, in some cases, include pesticide usage. The FEIR was revised to direct the reader to Agricultural resources section for a full evaluation of the project's compatibility with off-site agricultural operations including a discussion of adjacency areas and off-site spraying. The project design features combined with the required mitigation is adequate to protect future residences with adjacency issues.</p> <p>C1b-31 As discussed in the FEIR, subchapter 2.7, the risk of accidental release of chlorine gas is less than significant. Operation of the WRF would require the preparation of a Risk Management Plan or Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) pursuant to CalARP requirements (as discussed specifically in FEIR subchapter 2.7.1). These requirements state that any business handling, storing, or disposing of hazardous substance at or above the designated threshold quantity must prepare an emergency response plan designed to minimize hazards to human health and the environment from fires, explosions, or an unplanned release of hazardous substances into the air, soil, or surface water. The preparation of a Risk Management Plan is intended to aid both employers and employees in managing emergencies at a given facility, as well as to better prepare emergency response personnel for handling a wide range of emergencies that could potentially occur at the WRF. The multiple safety measures taken include required inspections by multiple agencies and the Risk Management Plan ensures that the impact of the location and operation of the Water Reclamation Facility (WRF) is less than significant. Any required risk analysis would be done when the plant is designed and the required RMP is prepared.</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1b-31 (cont.)</p> <p>The issue of the initial trucking of sewage is discussed in FEIR subchapter 3.1.7. The initial development within the project may be provided sewer service by means of trucking sewage from a collection point on-site to an existing wastewater treatment plant. This would be a temporary approach to allow sufficient wastewater flows to accumulate prior to the operation of a treatment plant. Trucking of sewage would be required for up to the first 100 homes (approximately three truck trips per day) to allow for a sufficient minimum flow to operate the facility. Trucking of sewage would be a temporary situation and would not result in any safety issues.</p> <p>C1b-32</p> <p>The commenter stated that emergency responses and evacuations would be severely impacted during a crisis event. For the project residents and the surrounding area, it should be pointed out that the primary requirements of an evacuation plan are to identify evacuation routes and to prepare residents for an emergency event. It is a key document for Incident Command when an emergency event occurs in the area. For preparedness of the residents, there is a key concept in the Plan known as “Ready! Set! Go!”. This is now a national program and focuses on education, awareness and preparedness for those living in the wildland-urban interface areas. The Plan also requires that the HOA and DSFPD distribute “Ready! Set! Go!” information on a continual basis along with maps showing the evacuation routes, temporary evacuation points and pre-identified safety zones. With respect to proposed upgrades to West Lilac and Circle R Drives, the project evaluates road safety in FEIR subchapter 2.3 and no impacts are found associated with the road improvements or proposed design exceptions.</p> <p>There are significant improvements for evacuation procedures for residents in all of San Diego County, e.g., reverse 911. The project meets County codes and ordinances regarding emergency evacuations. With respect to the project interfering with emergency response and evacuation during a crisis, as detailed in FEIR subchapter 2.7.2.4, implementation of the project’s evacuation plan which includes the identification of evacuation routes, a “Ready, Set , Go” program, and resident education component assures a safe program would be available during a crisis requiring evacuation. Therefore, there is no significant adverse impact associated with the project.</p>
--	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1b-32 (cont.)</p> <p>The commenter also stated that evacuation plans would be impacted by proposing road standard modifications. As described in the Traffic Impact Analysis (FEIR Appendix E), the proposed road modifications would not affect capacity of the roadways. Therefore, with the identification of evacuation routes and the preparedness of residents for an emergency event, a safe evacuation would be able to occur. It is also noted that in the event of a wildfire, tactical decisions by law enforcement and fire-fighting professionals usually result in evacuations based on controlled evacuations allowing smaller percentages of the evacuees are on the road at any one time. Trigger points are identified and would include ordering evacuations when a wildfire reaches a predetermined trigger point. This is usual operating procedure and is implemented to assist and coordinate mass evacuation planning for all residents in the area. Exit routes are available to the east in the event of a fire from the west. As shown on the Evacuation Plan, FEIR Figure 2.7-3, project traffic will use the eastern round-about to West Lilac Road, Covey Lane, and three emergency access road to Rodriguez Road.`</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 13

The applicant would further impact evacuation plans by proposing 10 road standard modifications that would lower the classification of the mobility element roads in some cases, lower the design speeds of those roads and assign some mobility element road segments to the list for failing roads with no beneficial mitigation possible. With lower design speeds, narrower roadways and inmitigable LOS issues, the Project will imperil evacuations from Bonsall and Valley Center to the I-15 corridor by existing residents, and impede the prospective residents of the Project at the same time. This kind of impact, played out in scenarios like Bonsall and Valley Center experienced in 2003 and 2007, would severely and significantly put hundreds of people at risk. Further, the Project has but a single evacuation route to the East. That is the easterly section of West Lilac Road that connects to Lilac Road. It is a Circulation Element 2.2 E two lane rural road. There are no plans to upgrade this road. If an evacuation event is caused by a large wildfire from the west, a panic evacuation will result over a single narrow, winding road made treacherous by the ensuing smoke plume.

C1b-32
cont.

The Project has not demonstrated that it can meet the 5-minute Emergency Response requirement for Fire Services. The proposed solutions of building a fourth fire station in the Deer Springs Fire Protection District [DSFPD] at the Project site do not work from the perspective of jurisdictional issues and fiscal operational cost issues. None of the existing fire stations in the DSFPD meet the 5-minute requirement for new development.

C1b-33

The Project is proposed for a site in a very high fire hazard severity zone [FHSZ]. Locating a Project of this size and scope in a very high FHSZ is not a smart location that is consistent with preventive land use planning. The RDEIR states that failure to meet the standard 100-foot Fuel Modification Zone [FMZ] for significant portions of the Project would be a significant impact. . Section 5.4 Fuel Management Zones on page 54 of the FPP states "The project includes a few areas where fuel modification zones are less than 100 feet wide." Based on even a quick scan of Figure 1.6 from Chapter 1 of the RDEIR, the more accurate and true statement is: The project includes extensive areas where fuel management zones are less than 100 feet wide. This is a severe design flaw.

C1b-34

Fire Protection Plan (FPP)

The proposed Project FPP does not meet the following basic requirements identified below by Issue Number:

1. Of the four Fire Station site Options proposed by the Applicant, none meet the minimum acceptance criteria of the Deer Springs Fire Protection District (DSFPD). The Charter of the DSFPD focuses on providing no greater than 5-minute emergency response time to the ENTIRE DSFPD, of which the proposed LHR Project is a subset.
2. The Applicant states in the FPP that the LHR Project fully complies with

C1b-35

C1b-33 Please see the Global Response: Fire and Medical Services.

C1b-34 In San Diego County's Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Wildland Fire and Fire Protection states that the FPP is a document that describes the level of fire hazard that would affect or be caused by a proposed development and the methods proposed to minimize that hazard. The FPP also evaluates the consistency of the proposed project with applicable fire protection regulations. In order to minimize hazards and meet fire code requirements, the FPP may include recommendations that involve limitations on future land use on the subject property, building construction standards, vegetation management, access improvements, installation of fire suppression facilities, and other design measures. The FPP must include measures to address the specific location, topography, geology, level of flammable vegetation and climate of the proposed project site. The FPP for the proposed Lilac Hills Ranch development follows the guidelines outlined by the County of San Diego for a FPP.

The project proposes customized fuel modification based on site specific fire behavior modeling and risk assessments as evaluated in the FPP. In these areas, off-site, adjacent land uses and overall fuel densities and terrain justify less than 100 feet of fuel modification zone. Also, the justification is based on adjacent flame lengths and heat intensity. The reduced fuel modification zones are allowed per the Fire Code as were approved by the DSFPD. For all locations where less than 100-feet of fuel modification are identified, the project is required to implement Mitigation Measure M-HZ-1, which requires (A) a recorded easement on adjacent property to allow compliance with the 100-foot FMZ standards; (B) a selection of alternative mitigation measures from those described in the FPP that would achieve the same level of protection. The specific measures would be subject to approval by DSFPD and, once approved would be incorporated into the site plan and/or use permit plot plan for the area. These alternative measure could include:

1. Additional ignition-resistant construction methods and other non-combustible features, such as parking lots, sidewalks, concrete patios, decorative rock, natural boulders on-site, and similar landscape features; and/or
2. Fire-barrier walls.

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>the DSFPD Ordinance No. 2010-01, County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code, and County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. <i>The LHR has factual compliance issues with all of these regulations.</i></p> <p>3. The FPP focuses nearly exclusively on Wildfire Management and does not sufficiently address either Structure Fires or Emergency Medical Service (EMS).</p> <p>4. The FPP doesn't adequately address and analyze the Environmental Impact of the use of six electronic road gates on fire access roads.</p> <p>Fuel Modification Zones (FMZ) – The applicant appears to rely on other property owners outside the LHR Subdivision boundaries to comply with the 100 foot FMZ requirement.</p> <p>Thus, the proposal amounts to putting a large project with several vulnerable populations into a very high fire hazard severity zone with substandard fuel modification zones and depending on more rigorous construction techniques to restore a margin of fire safety. The question becomes why the applicant hasn't redesigned the Project to allow for standard FMZs throughout the Project? This problem is strained further by uncertain access to the Project site by fire apparatus. That access depends on at least two private roads, for which easement access is uncertain, and the applicant's proposal to gate those access points. These constraints on access are problematic for fire safety and evacuation efficiency.</p> <p>4. Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes Resultant from Project Implementation</p> <p>The proposed Project [Lilac Hills Ranch] will cause significant, irreversible, and, in most instances, inmitigable impacts to the Project site, to the Valley Center and Bonsall communities and their community plans and to the County of San Diego and its General Plan. The Project will require amendments to the General Plan, its principles, policies, and regional land use designations and to the Bonsall and Valley Center Community Plans, or, at least, a severely disfigured interpretation of all of them. Why would the County risk upsetting the entire General Plan, not to mention the Community Plans, by acceding to the wishes of the developer to amend them to suit this Project?</p> <p>The RDEIR focuses on the grading of the Project site, on the use of fuels [energy] to prepare the Project site and manufacture construction materials, on the consumption of construction materials [wood, concrete, asphalt, drywall, etc.], on subsequent energy and natural resource consumption by the eventual residents, and on the amount of time to construct the project. If the County needed the additional EDU to meet housing goals for build-out of the General Plan such expenditures of energy and materials would be more understandable; but, since the additional EDU are not needed, why would the County approve of what amounts to a waste of resources?</p>	<p>C1b-34 (cont.) The specific details of Mitigation Measure M-HZ-1 is discussed in FEIR subchapter 2.7.5, to assure that impacts associated with the reduced FMZs would be less than significant. These mitigation measures would provide fire protection equal to a 100-foot FMZ.</p> <p>C1b-35 Detailed responses to these issues are included in Letter I51i responses to comments I51i-2 through I51i-20.</p> <p>C1b-36 As detailed in Section 4.5 of the FPP, and FEIR, subchapter 2.7.2.4 and Capabilities Assessment pp 12-13, off-site clearing is one of a number of alternative measures proposed to mitigate for reduced fuel modification zones. Off-site clearing would only be allowed under a recorded easement acquired from adjacent landowners for the purpose of maintaining required fuel modification. There is no off-site clearing proposed; however, if off-site clearing is proposed in the future, the easements must be provided before the project can move forward and additional environmental analysis may be required.</p> <p>C1b-37 Proposed gates would not impeded fire and emergency vehicles from gaining entrance into the project site. Emergency personnel would have the ability to open gates through KNOX systems or remote sirens. See also response to comment C1b-34.</p> <p>C1b-38 The project proposes and will require a project-specific General Plan Amendment (GPA 12-001). Specifically, GPA 12-001 proposes to: (1) amend the regional Land Use Element map to allow a new Village Regional Category, (2) amend the Valley Center Community Plan Map to allow Village Residential and Village Core land use designations (and revise the community plan text to include the project), (3) amend the Bonsall Community Plan to allow Village Residential land use designations, and (4) amend the Mobility Element to reclassify West Lilac Road and specify the reclassified road segments at Table M-4. An amendment to Table M-4 would be required because the reduction of West Lilac Road from a 2.2C to a 2.2F with the inclusion of Road 3 (Running Creek Road) results in West Lilac Road operating below acceptable levels of service. Details for the justification of West Lilac's inclusion on Table M-4 are discussed in subchapter 3.1.4 (Land Use Planning) of the FEIR. (FEIR, subchapter 1.2.1.1) Such amendment is purely specific to the proposed project. The FEIR frames the General Plan</p>
---	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1b-38 (cont.)</p> <p>consistency analysis at Subchapter 1.4 under “Environmental Setting,” and describes its current land use planning context (current general plan land uses and both community plans). (FEIR, subchapter 1.4.) Section 1.6 describes the General Plan amendment required for approval of the project and that is analyzed by the FEIR. The General Plan Regional Land Use Map is proposed to be amended to remove the existing regional category and land use designation and to re-designate the project area as Village. Then subsequently provides detailed analysis of the physical environmental impacts that may flow from the GPA in Chapters 2.0 and 3.0, as well as providing a detailed policy consistency analysis in the Land Use Planning section, subchapter 3.1.4 (See FEIR, Chapter 3.0; Appendix W)</p> <p>Thus, the FEIR provides an analysis of the potential physical environmental impacts that would result from project approval and the amendment of the Regional Land Use Element Map to change the regional land use category from Semi-Rural to Village.</p> <p>See also Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 and Appendix W for a thorough analysis of this issue.</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 15

The movement of over 4-million cubic yards of dirt and rock on the Project site is perhaps the most obvious irreversible impact. Another is the loss of hundreds of acres of productive agricultural land for future production. Another is the loss of significant amounts of biological habitat and the flora and fauna that presently occupy them. The RDEIR does not adequately address the cumulative impact of scores of such individual losses caused by multiple projects within the County and the irreversible loss of the majority of native habitats in the aggregation of those individual losses. Why are such losses necessary when alternatives that have dramatically less environmental impact are available to achieve the Project's myopic objectives?

Less obvious losses are the changes to the General Plan and related Community Plans that will be required for this Project to be approved. Those changes will dramatically alter the parameters of the General Plan that strive for smart growth. And, if the Project is approved, it will set a precedent that will have severe ramifications across the unincorporated countryside of San Diego County.

D. Chapter 3

1. Water Quality/Hydrology

The RDEIR concludes under Issue 1: Water Quality Standards and Requirements in Chapter 3.0 "Environmental Effects Found Not to be Significant" as follows:

"Through these design features, including the use of permeable pavers, the project would not result in the violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Impacts associated with this issue would be less than significant."

We strongly disagree with this finding and conclude that there is high likelihood of potentially significant and immitigable impacts.

Off-site routes for recycled water and sewer pipelines have been found to lack sufficient legal right-of-way easements as represented in figure 3.1-8, "Off-site Sewer Collection System." This determination is confirmed by Valley Center Municipal Water District [VCMWD] in a letter labeled Attachment A. This finding makes construction of sewer and recycled water pipelines for the Project problematic.

Use of the Lower Moosa Water Reclamation Facility [LMWRF] for a series of alternative sewage solutions has been proposed. The LMWRF was built in 1974 and provides disinfected secondary treatment of reclaimed water only. It has

C1b-39

C1b-40

C1b-41

C1b-42

C1b-43

C1b-39 Refer to the responses to letter C1p which addresses these comments in detail.

C1b-40 The comment expresses the opinion of the commenter and does not raise a specific environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA.

C1b-41 The FEIR is adequate and fully addresses the water quality impacts associated with the proposed project as subchapter 3.1.3 and the Hydromodification Management Plan (Appendix U3). The impact analysis and significance conclusions presented in the EIR are based upon and supported by substantial evidence, including the technical analyses provided as appendices to the EIR. The design for the current Implementing TM (and all future Implementing TM's) will conform to all current SUSMP, hydromodification and drainage attenuation requirements in the County of San Diego. These reports demonstrated that the proposed development has adequate mitigation facilities to address water quality, hydromodification and 100-year peak runoff volume attenuation.

C1b-42 See Global Response: Easements (Covey Lane and Mountain Ridge Roads) included in the introduction to these Responses to Comments. See also, Off-Site Improvements – Environmental Analysis and Easement Summary Table for additional information responsive to this comment. The alternatives for off-site routes for sewer and water pipelines are identified in the Wastewater Management Report (Appendix S of the FEIR).

As shown in FEIR Figures 3.1-7a, 3.1-7b, and 3.1-7c-1 and 3.1-7c-2 all piping (potable water, recycled water, and sewer lines) proposed within any potential routes, including Covey Lane, Mountain Ridge, and Circle R Drive, would have adequate spacing and would be able to fit within the existing right-of-way.

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>been approved by two agencies to double the LMWRF capacity to 1.0 million gallons/day [MGD] of influent. That capacity is not presently added.</p> <p>If eventually expanded, likely it would be required to upgrade its treatment to tertiary standards to allow beneficial use of the recycled water on landscaping and golf courses and to prevent degrading the water quality of the San Luis Rey Basin watershed. Current capacity of the LMWRF is 0.5 MGD and it is currently averaging 0.35 MGD of influent. The present ground water percolation pond capacity is 0.44 MGD. At present capacities, LMWRF could accept a maximum of 450 additional equivalent dwelling units [EDU]. However there is some question whether the capacity of the percolation ponds would be allowed to reach the 0.44 MGD limit. Several already pending permit applications, which could reduce the 450 additional EDUs, further complicate matters. Delays for permitting and construction could make the capacity improvements unavailable for some time. Another factor is the limited available space at LMWRF for the expansion.</p> <p>Analysis of tabular data from the Waste Water Management of Alternatives Study [table 5-1] calls into question the availability of adequate acreage to discharge recycled water beneficially on-site.</p> <p>It appears that the Hydro Modification Design is relying on exaggerated assumptions for both rainwater harvesting success and the availability of residential landscape areas as permeable surfaces for absorption of water. That same design also reveals the desire to install 23 acres of private roads paved with permeable pavers to permit additional percolation of water into the soil. Such roads may fail under the weight of a Type 1 fire engine.</p> <p>It is tortured logic to argue that taking green field agricultural and semi rural estate land and introducing a dense urban environment that develops 504 of the 608 acres, adding 83 acres of road and 68 acres of manufactured slopes is consistent with policy COS-5.2 which requires development to minimize the use of impervious surfaces.</p> <p>2. Public Services We are informed that several local public service organizations will be responding to the RDEIR within the scope of their responsibility to provide such services. We have spoken to the Valley Center Municipal Water District, Valley Center Pauma Unified School District, Deer Springs Fire Protection District, the San Diego County Sheriff's Department, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. [Five emails to/from agencies are attached]</p> <p>3. Geology and Supplemental Geology Report The review identifies questions regarding the need for blasting for cuts that exceed 50-feet in depth to facilitate the movement of over 4-Million cubic yards of</p>	<p>C1b-43 cont.</p> <p>C1b-44</p> <p>C1b-45</p> <p>C1b-46</p> <p>C1b-47</p> <p>C1b-48</p> <p>C1b-43 It is acknowledged that all the permits and issues listed would need to be addressed by VCMWD to enable the expansion of the Lower Moosa Water Reclamation Facility as a possible wastewater treatment option for the project. If these permits cannot be obtained to the satisfaction of the regulatory agencies then the project would proceed with one of the other methods for treatment and disposal of wastewater as directed by VCMWD. Any expansion at the LMWRF beyond its current capacity would include the addition of tertiary treatment facilities to allow for recycled water use as a means of effluent disposal. As discussed at EIR subchapter 3.1.7.2 two options for wastewater treatment for the project would not require increased capacity for the LMWRF as such treatment would occur on-site.</p> <p>C1b-44 Table 5-1 is an arithmetic illustration of how the area needed for application of reclaimed water changes depending on the rate of application. VCMWD would ultimately determine how much reclaimed water would be used within the project site and how much would be used elsewhere. We have proposed storage onsite for unused reclaimed water.</p> <p>The recycled water application rates will be in accordance with the County of San Diego guidelines for the appropriate plant material. Turf requires 4 acre-feet per acre per year which is the high-end of the irrigation application scale and ornamental landscaping requires approximately 3 acre-feet per acre per year. The developed areas would include over 111 acres of open space such as parks, slopes, and common open space, all of which would be landscaped. The Specific Plan would guide development throughout the many years needed to construct the project to assure that there is enough acreage on-site to discharge the recycled water. Recycled water use on the project will conform to all applicable state, federal and local guidelines relating to possible discharges, if any, to Section 404 waters.</p> <p>C1b-45 The County does not agree that the hydromodification report relies on exaggerated assumptions. As explained at Subchapter 3.1.3 of the EIR, rain water harvesting on residential units is not a requirement of the project, but may be used as a supplement to use of three (3) hydromodification mitigation ponds or detentions basins</p>
---	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

	<p>C1b-45 (cont.)</p> <p>as the primary means to mitigate impacts for project-related storm water discharges. As presented in the Major SWMP for Lilac Hills Ranch – Implementing TM, Attachment I, the potential total rain barrel volume is 0.2 acre feet, which is just a fraction of the capacity of the detention basins. If this alternative were utilized, the proposed rain barrels would not be a significant component of the required on-site detention facilities. The impact of a very small fractional decrease in storage volume offset would not have a high likelihood of potentially significant impact. Furthermore, the rain barrels were not modeled into the hydromodification analysis, thus, the calculations presented in the report essentially anticipated a 100% hard failure. This is a worst case analysis.</p> <p>The project design does not rely on permeable pavers in roadways. The current street design reflects the traditional asphalt concrete black tops. The permeable pavers were only discussed as a potential alternative to the traditional black top pavement. The Implementing TM SWMP, hydromodification, hydrology report and Master TM hydrology report clearly state that these permeable pavers are not being proposed as part of this project. However, it must be clarified that the pavers are not designed to allow storm water to percolate into the soils. Per the typical paver sections presented in the above mentioned reports, an impermeable liner is to be installed at the bottom of the subbase material with a perforated pipe sloped to drain to the closest storm drain.</p> <p>C1b-46 The overall project (i.e. Master TM) proposes to conserve approximately 104 acres of natural land and 20.8 acres of agricultural land undisturbed. The project proposes all privately maintained roadways on-site conform to the current County of San Diego Private Road standards. These privately maintained roadways would have reduced pavement width to minimize impervious surfaces that satisfies the COS-5.2 requirement to minimize the use of impervious surfaces.</p> <p>C1b-47 Any letters received during the public review period will be responded to in their entirety and included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.</p>
--	---

LETTER

RESPONSE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 17

dirt and rock. Given the phasing of the project, Silicates will be a potential hazard relative to the AQMD standards for a period of as much as 10-years or even longer.

Slope Stability and Remediation describe cut slopes (6.2.1) and fill (manufactured slopes 6.2.2) in excess of seventy-feet (70-feet) in height. There are no seventy-foot high manufactured slopes existing in this community, which makes these proposed slopes out of character with the community.

E. Chapter 4 – Project Alternatives

The Lilac Hills Ranch Project Alternatives from Chapter 4.0 of the RDEIR are below:

1. No Project/No Development Alternative
2. No Project / Existing Legal Lot Alternative (49 EDU + no commercial)
3. General Plan Consistent Alternative (110 EDU + no commercial)
4. Reduced Footprint Alternative (1251 EDU + 6 acres of commercial)
5. Reduced Intensity Alternative (881 EDU + 5.6 acres of commercial)
6. 2.2C (Hybrid) Alternative (1365 EDU + 15.3 acres of commercial)
7. Roadway Design Alternative (1746 EDU + 17.3 acres of commercial)
8. Mountain Ridge Road Fire Station Alternative (1746 EDU + 17.3 acres of commercial)

The County's Project Alternatives Analysis in Chapter 4 of the RDEIR is grossly defective in meeting CEQA requirements in five areas that are summarized below:

1. The RDEIR Objectives against which the Alternatives are judged for Environmental Impacts are biased and should be changed to equitable objectives, from which compliance against can be fairly measured.
2. The Project does not meet its own Objectives, when fairly assessed.
3. There is a valid offsite alternative – the Downtown Escondido Specific Plan Area (SPA) that needs to be included as an Alternative.
4. The Reduced Footprint, Reduced Intensity, and 2.2 C Hybrid are not valid Alternatives. These three "Alternatives" are density variations of the Project. These Alternatives are also not described in enough detail to provide informed Environmental Impact Analysis. [see table 1]
5. The Alternatives were not fairly assessed in the RDEIR by the Applicant.
6. When all nine Alternatives are fairly assessed, the Downtown Escondido SPA meets more Objectives than the Project or any Alternatives.

C1b-48
cont.

C1b-49

C1b-48 With respect to potential exposure to Crystalline Silica due to blasting of dirt and rocks, please see FEIR Chapter 2.2. As detailed in subchapter 2.2.2.4, crystalline silica was evaluated for its effect on existing residents, future project occupants, and construction workers. It has been conservatively assumed each of the project phases would involve grading of 50,000 tons per day of material, with the total movement of material, including aggregate rock, to be 4 million tons. The aggregate rock quantities are estimated to be approximately 15,000 tons per day (10,000 cy * 1.5 tons/cy = 15,000 tons), based on the blasting analysis. The project has a work schedule of 5 days a week, 8 hours a day. Thus, the project would not exceed the actual or permitted aggregate mining operations assessed under the SCAQMD study used as a threshold for significance for Crystalline Silica exposure. Construction and blasting activities from the project are expected to have impacts that are less than significant due to crystalline silica.

With respect to slope stability, as shown in FEIR Figure 2.1-1, the project site contains several existing slopes exceeding 70 feet in height. As discussed in the Geology Report prepared for the project (FEIR Appendix N), the highest proposed cut slope is approximately 70 feet at a slope ratio of 2:1. The highest proposed fill slope is approximately 70 feet. all manufactured slopes exceeding a ratio of 5 to 1 (horizontal to vertical), the ground will be keyed or benched. Additional specific project design features for slope stability and remediation are detailed in subchapter 6.2 FEIR Appendix N. The application of these recommendations would reduce potential impacts associated slope stability to less than significant.

C1b-49 The majority of this comment provides factual background information. With respect to the reference that the Downtown Escondido Specific Plan would be an environmentally superior alternative, please see response to comments C1s-11 and 12 (VCCPG- Alternatives 2013 letter).

Table 1 -Scant Attributes of 3 Alternates Provided								
Land Use	Project		Reduced Footprint		Reduced Intensity		2.2 C (Hybrid)	
	Gross Acreage	Units/ Sq. Ft.	Gross Acreage	Units/ Sq. Ft.	Gross Acreage	Units/ Sq. Ft.	Gross Acreage	Units/Sq. Ft.
Single Family Detached	158.8	903	142.1	783	275.5	881	177.0	792
Single Family Senior	75.9	468	71.1	468	0		75.9	468
Single Family Attached	7.9	164	0		0		4.3	105
Commercial/Mixed Use	15.3	211	6.0		5.6		15.3	
Water Reclamation	2.4		2.4		2.4		2.4	
RF/Trailhead	0.6		0		0.6		0.6	
Detention Basin	9.4		5.4		5.5		5.5	
School Site	12.0		9.0		0		12.0	
Private Recreation	2.0		0		0		2.0	
Group Residential/Care	6.5		0		0		6.5	
Institutional	10.7		10.7		10.7		10.7	
Park - HOA	11.8		10.0		3.0		11.8	
Park - Dedicated to County	12.0		6.0		9.0		12.0	
Biological Open Space	103.6		168.8		102.7		103.6	
Non-circulating Road	45.7		45.7		41.5		43.1	
Circulating Road	37.6		37.6		21.5		30.0	
Common Areas/Agriculture	20.2		20.2		65.0		45.0	
Manufactured Slopes	67.5		67.5		65.0		50.0	
Other/Accretive Math Error*	8.1		5.5		0		0.3	
Total	608.0	1746	608.0	1251	608.0	881	608.0	1365
* Table 4-1 from DEIR Chapter 4 Project Alternatives has the indicated arithmetic errors								
sq. ft. = Square Feet								
HOA = Homeowner's Association								

C1b-49
cont.

Table 2, below, rates scoring of Alternatives against the Applicant's biased eight Objectives.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 19

Objectives	Project	Alternates						
		Downtown Escondido SPA	No Project/No Development	No Project/Legal Lot	General Plan Consistent	Reduced Footprint	Reduced Intensity	2.2 C Hybrid
1 - Develop a community within northern San Diego County in close proximity to a major transportation corridor consistent with the County's Community Development Model for a walkable pedestrian-oriented mixed-use community	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
2 - Provide a range of housing and lifestyle opportunities in a manner that encourages walking and riding bikes, and that provides public services and facilities that are accessible to residents of both the community and the surrounding area	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
3 - Provide a variety of recreational opportunities including parks for active and passive activities, and trails available to the public that connect the residential neighborhoods to the town and neighborhood centers	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4 - Integrate major physical features into the project design, including major drainages, and woodlands creating a hydrologically sensitive community in order to reduce urban runoff	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
5 - Preserve sensitive natural resources by setting aside land within a planned and integrated preserve area	Yes	N/A	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6 - Accommodate future population growth in San Diego County by providing a range of diverse housing types, including mixed-use and senior housing	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
7 - Provide the opportunity for residents to increase the recycling of waste	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8 - Provide a broad range of educational, recreational, and social uses and economically viable commercial opportunities within a walkable distance from the residential uses	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Total Number of Objectives Met	5/8	7/8	2/8	2/8	4/8	4/8	4/8	5/8

Clearly, the least Environmental Impact, even to these biased Objectives, is shown in Table 2 to be the Downtown Escondido SPA Alternative.

More importantly, the General Plan alternative must be properly considered by the applicants and County, rather than focus their attention strictly within the boundaries of the Project. Apart from the time and money already spent developing the General Plan [12 years and \$18.6 million], it was designed as a plan for the entirety of the County's unincorporated area while being mindful of the incorporated cities as well. The Lilac Hills Ranch Project is only a single piece of a much larger puzzle.

To study this "puzzle piece" is NOT to study the General Plan alternative. This "half-study" misses the underlying logic of the new County General Plan which is, according to the lengthy introduction to the GP, to achieve "sustainable development" with a two-part strategy called Smart Growth.

- I. Part One: Direct new growth to areas where infrastructure already exists (such as the established Village in

C1b-49
cont.

C1b-50

C1b-50

The General Plan Consistency Alternative is considered among the project's reasonable range of alternatives. The project is not required to study the entire General Plan as an alternative, but rather offer project specific alternatives pursuant to CEQA. As discussed in subchapter 4.4 of the FEIR, Development at the existing General Plan densities would not meet most of the other project objectives. It would not allow for a walkable community, would not include any commercial/retail services, and would not provide for diverse types of housing, all of which are achieved in the Village-style design of the project. The FEIR does consider development at General Plan densities, as described in FEIR subchapter 4.4, Analysis of the General Plan Consistent Alternative. The EIR concludes that the General Plan Consistency Alternative would result in fewer impacts to agricultural impacts as compared to the project.

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>Valley Center's central valley.</p> <p>II. Part Two: Retain agriculture and large parcels for functioning rural lands that clean the air, provide vital watersheds, and support diverse forms of wildlife among other functions.</p> <p>The plan works ONLY when its two interdependent parts work together.</p> <p>The Lilac Hills Ranch Project undermines both aspects of this strategy. The General Plan alternative implements both aspects of this strategy. The only acceptable "study" of the General Plan Alternative is to study it in its entirety. The superior solution will be clear.</p> <p>F. Specific Plan The comments on the Specific Plan include several major concerns:</p> <p>1. The Lilac Hills Ranch Project [the Project] is too large and too dense for Valley Center and Bonsall and it is improperly located. Urban densities are incompatible with the rural, agricultural location in which the Project has been sited.</p> <p>2. Roads and Traffic. The road standard modifications proposed by the Project will downgrade the classification of a mobility element road [West Lilac Road] and will lower the design speeds of several road segments, both public and private. At the same time the Project will add over 5000 people and approximately 20,000 average daily trips to those narrower, slower roads causing congestion and road failure. Several Mobility Element Road segments associated with the Project will be allowed to sink to LOS E/F without mitigation because there wouldn't be commensurate benefit realized by adding lanes.</p> <p>3. Compliance with the General Plan. The Project's Specific Plan threatens to overturn virtually every element in the County's new General Plan adopted in 2011 after 12 years of discussion, compromise and community involvement, over \$18 million in government expenditures and countless hours of effort on the part of local citizens. Approval of this Project will require damaging amendments to the General Plan and the Valley Center and Bonsall Community Plans that will be growth inducing, particularly in the western portion of Valley Center. If this Project is allowed to proceed, one has to question if there is any development that would be rejected because it violated the principles and policies of the General Plan and Community Plans. In the context of this Project, it is</p>	<p>C1b-50 cont.</p> <p>C1b-51</p> <p>C1b-52</p> <p>C1b-53</p> <p>C1b-51 The comment expresses the opinions of the commentator only. For a discussion of the project's agricultural compatibility issues, please see Chapter 2.4 of the FEIR.</p> <p>C1b-52 The General Plan recognizes that under allowable circumstances deficient roadway segments throughout the County are to be accepted and allowed to operate at lower standards. Table M-4 of the Mobility Element identifies these deficient roadways and describes the rationale for accepting deficient roadway segments. The project includes amending Mobility Element Table M-4 to include Old Highway 395 from East Dulin Road to West Lilac Road, West Lilac Road from Old Highway 395 to the project entrance (2.2C) and from the project entrance to Road 3 (2.2F), and Old Highway 395 between West Lilac Road and the I-15 SB ramps. Justification for the addition of these roadways to Table M-4 include the potential impact to important habitats, or destruction of archaeological sites. Additionally, the improvement of West Lilac Road to 2.2C width would require the condemnation of private land and the removal of driveway access to homes on the northern side of West Lilac Road.</p> <p>C1b-53 See Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 for a response relevant to this comment.</p>
---	---

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 21

unclear that the General Plan is anything more than a placeholder until the next change is proposed.

C1b-53
cont.

4. Services and Infrastructure - Water, Schools, Fire, Wastewater Treatment— Infrastructure is expensive. Putting in new roads, adding additional lanes to a bridge, building a fire station, putting up a new school, installing sewer and waste treatment plants and building trails all cost large amounts of money. A principal reason why the General Plan Update strongly favors "compact, town center developments," while stating that it intends to limit "growth in areas without adequate roads, water and sewer service," is because of the demands on the public purse for building and then maintaining these infrastructure items over and over.

C1b-54

The Project is seeking to build a city the size of Del Mar, CA that will require an almost entirely new infrastructure—new roads, schools, sewer systems and a broad range of other infrastructure items. These infrastructure expansions are why the Valley Center Community Plan designates the North and South villages at the core of Valley Center for such housing and commercial densities. The Community Development Model also directs that kind of concentration of density and infrastructure not at the outer edge of the community as this Project proposes, but at the Valley Center core.

5. LEED-ND/Sustainable and Walkable Community. This Project still has not meaningfully addressed the requirements for LEED-ND development, although it continues to be described as "designed to meet the standards of the LEED-ND or an equivalent program." There is no equivalent program cited and the Project fails to meet any of the site location and linkage requirements listed in the LEED-ND pre-requisites and standards.

C1b-55

The Project also cites its consistency with the Guiding Principles and the Community Development Model in the General Plan for San Diego County. However, even a cursory examination of those principles and the model show that, rather than being consistent, the Project is conversely inconsistent with both the Guiding Principles and Community Development Model. The 'community' that needs to be addressed is the Valley Center community, and the Project should be understood as an element of that community. The General Plan presently applies the Community Development Model to the Valley Center community and the zoning and land use patterns within Valley Center are consistent with that model. The same is true for the Bonsall community. The proposed addition of the LHR Project in the western portion of the Valley Center community flouts the intention of the Community Development Model by establishing high-density development away from the community center, away from needed infrastructure, and in a designated agricultural area.

C1b-56

C1b-54 Please see the Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 for a response relevant to this comment especially the project's consistency with the Community Development Model.

C1b-55 Please see Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2. See also response C1b-3 above.

Please see the Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 for a response relevant to this comment especially the project's consistency LEED-ND.

C1b-56 Please see Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2.

LETTER

RESPONSE

<p>The Project is leapfrog development and it does not qualify as a LEED-ND community under any reasonable interpretation of those standards.</p> <p>6. Agriculture— The General Plan Update of 2011 has set aside the area where The Project would be built as a place for agriculture and other rural and semi rural uses. In contrast to the claims made by the Project applicants, the area is not characterized by historical agricultural activity. It is a present-day agricultural area with a long, continuous history of agriculture. Avocado, citrus, cactus commercial nurseries and other farm operations are located in and around the Project areas. These agricultural uses attract insect and fungal infestations, which mean that aerial spraying is often necessary. Spraying could pose a danger to sensitive individuals living in the area. On the other hand, prohibiting spraying would make farming nearly impossible. Building the Project at the planned site would greatly damage many currently productive and successful agricultural businesses.</p> <p>7. Twists of meaning and lack of clarity in the plan. One of the most difficult aspects of the Project's Specific Plan is the extent to which it makes misleading claims. They would have us believe that they are building a LEED-ND or equivalent development even though The Project violates nearly all LEED-ND standards for site selection and linkage; that adding 5,000 residents to a rural, agricultural area actually improves traffic over narrow, winding rural roads; that grading and moving 4-million cubic yards of earth (enough to build a path 4-feet wide around the equator of Earth) preserves natural resources and habitat for animals.</p> <p>In addition, after criticizing four previous iterations of the Specific Plan, this version continues to use conditional and indefinite language to describe aspects of the Project that should be, at this stage, unconditional and definite. It seems as if the applicants want us to review and approve a suggestion, or a concept rather than a specific plan that defines their intentions.</p> <p>There are many other concerns addressed in the Specific Plan comment document. They range from the size and type of parks in the Project to the Fire Protection Plan, from the Water Reclamation Facility to open space and preservation policies, from D special area regulations to circulation elements. There are too many to reasonably relate in this summary. An indication of the severity of impact this Project has on the project site is provided by the sheer number of significant impacts, mitigable or not, listed in the table S-1 of the EIR Executive Summary, <i>SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS</i>. A project plagued by many issues that will have such a drastic impact on the communities of Valley</p>	<p>C1b-56 (cont.)</p> <p>C1b-57</p> <p>C1b-58</p> <p>C1b-59</p> <p>C1b-60</p> <p>C1b-57 The property is currently designated as Semi-Rural, which is intended for lower-density residential neighborhoods and agricultural operations. The existing A70, Limited Agricultural Use Regulations, which are intended to create and preserve areas intended primarily for agricultural crop production.</p> <p>Historical and present uses are all accurately described in the FEIR in Chapter 1.0 and subchapter 2.4.</p> <p>As discussed in FEIR Chapter 2.4, agricultural adjacency issues could be significant due to the proposed development's location near agricultural operations that currently utilize on-site pesticide sprays. The specific locations of these adjacency areas (where pesticide application permits have been approved) are depicted on FEIR Figure 2.4-4. Impacts associated with pesticide drift will be less than significant. As detailed in FEIR Chapter 2.4, State pesticide regulations prohibit discharging pesticides directly onto a neighboring property without the consent of the owner or operator of the property, and there are also regulations and label requirements that prevent or minimize "drift" during aerial applications. Additionally, the project is required to implement Mitigation Measures M-AG-2 (agricultural buffer), M-AG-3 (fencing), M-AG-4 (limited building zones) to assure adequate spacing and buffering between those on-site areas with sensitive uses and those off-site operations utilizing pesticides. Implementation of the mitigation measures, coupled with state regulations assure that impacts associated with pesticides will be less than significant.</p> <p>C1b-58 The Specific Plan complies with the Government Code and provides all necessary information. The comment expresses the opinions of the commentator only. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required. Please also refer to the Global Response: Project Consistency with General Plan Policy LU-1.2 and Appendix W.</p>
---	--

LETTER

RESPONSE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 23

Center and Bonsall, not to mention the region of north San Diego County, should not proceed any farther toward approval.



C1b-60
cont.

C1b-59 The Specific Plan meets State requirements which include a text and “diagram” that specifies the distribution, location and extent of all land uses, public and private infrastructure and standards and criteria by which development will proceed. The Specific Plan meets all these requirements. Flexibility is allowed to ensure that the Specific Plan account for small changes or unforeseen circumstances Within the General Plan, Policy LU-1.8 allows flexibility in design when approved subject to a Specific Plan.

C1b-60 For detailed responses to these issues, please see responses to comments to the multiple letters submitted by the VCCPG.